Baconiana.

VOL. VIII.—*New Series.* OCTOBER, 1900. No. 32.

"FRANCIS BACON'S BILITERAL CIPHER."

BEFORE these lines are printed, Mrs. Gallup's very important work on "The Biliteral Cipher of Francis Bacon"* will have been for two months in the hands of the public. Since it is probable that there may be due discussion of its wonderful contents, it seems desirable to say a few words, not by way of review or mere expression of personal opinion (in such a case valueless), but in order to draw attention to certain points which, if not at present capable of absolute verification or contradiction, yet surely demand and are worthy of the closest investigation. Questions of this kind must naturally arise, "Is this cipher such as any person of ordinary intelligence can follow? Is it provably correct? Has anyone besides Mrs. Gallup succeeded in deciphering by the same means, and with similar results?"

These questions may without hesitation be answered in the affirmative. With the explanation given by the great inventor himself, anyone can master the method described in the *De Augmentis* (Book VI.). Ordinary patience and contrivance enable us to arrange two different alphabets of italic letters and to insert these in the printed type, forming cipher sentences one-fifth in length of the "exterior" sentence or passage. Thus to bury one story within another is easy enough. To unearth it is another matter, and more difficult.

In the first place, there is nothing which particularly invites the decipherer to discriminate between the two forms of italic letters which are essential to this typographical cipher; or, if differences or deformities in letters are observed, we have been required to believe them "errors," defects in printing, carelessness of the compositor, or anything else which many explain them away. Be not deceived; there is no error, but consummate skill and subtle contrivance, all helping towards the cryptographer's great ends.

* Pub.: Gay and Bird, London. The Howard Publishing Company, Detroit.

Before beginning the work of deciphering, it is needful thoroughly to learn by heart the Biliteral Alphabet given by its Inventor in the *De Augmentis*. Here we see that the letters of the common Alphabet are formed by the combination of the letters A and B in five places, these two letters (A and B) being represented by two distinct "founts" of italic type. To discriminate between these two founts, is the initial difficulty; but observing that, in the Biliteral Alphabet, *A's preponderate*, and that *no combination begins with two B's*, we judge that the most frequent forms of italic letters are almost certain to be A's. A decision is best arrived at by repeatedly tracing and drawing out the various letters; and the decipherer must have keen eyes and powers of observation to detect the minute differences. For our Francis would not make things too easy. He speaks of "marks" and "signs" to be heeded, and Roman letters are often interspersed. It is also patent (and was found by Mrs. Gallup, and independently by others) that, in every biliteral alphabet, letters are here and there intentionally exchanged, as a device to confuse and confound the would-be decipherer.

In many cases we find alphabets suddenly reversed—A becoming B, and B, A, a change hinted by some "mark" or "sign," as a tiny dot. These changes seem to occur most frequently in very small books, where the limited space makes it the more needful to set snares and stumbling-blocks at every turn. Such things show that, besides the good eyes and keen wits required for successful deciphering, there must be no small amount of that "eternal patience" which Michael Angelo honoured with the title of "genius."

Let us contemplate the goodly volume presented to us by Mrs. Gallup, and try to realise the fact that every one of those 350 pages of deciphered matter was worked out *letter by letter;* that each ONE letter in this deciphered work represents FIVE letters extracted from the deciphered book—say, *Shakespeare*, or *Spenser*, *Burton*, or any of the eight groups of works indicated in the cipher. Not only should such reflections cause us highly to respect the "endless patience," perseverance, and skill of the cryptographer to whose labours we are so deeply indebted, but they should warn us from depreciating or discrediting statements or methods which we ourselves are incapable of testing. "Disparage not the faith thou dost not know," is a good, sound principle to begin upon, and Francis ("cunynng in the humours of persons") had evidently observed the tendency of the human mind to

fly from things troublesome, or to take refuge in disparagement and ridicule. His notes teem with reflections on this matter. "Things above us are nothing to us"—"just nothing." "Many things are thought impossible until they are discovered, then men wonder that they had not been seen long before." On the other hand, he continually encourages himself with thoughts, texts, and proverbial philosophy, which we find him instilling into his disciples. "Everything is subtile till it is conceived." "By trying, men gained Troy," and so forth. But we must "woorke as God woorkes," wisely, quietly, with persistent patience and unremitting care, and "from a good beginning cometh a good ending."

The rules laid down in the *Advancement of Learning* must have been perfectly understood, not only by the fraternity instructed in their use, and deputed to hand down this knowledge, but they also must have been, and still be known to a certain high circle of compositors and printers (formerly, for the most part publishers,) whose duty it was to insert the cipher by means of the two founts of italic type.

It is the belief of the present writer that certain verbal instructions were (*and are*) given, as well as some mechanical aids to expedite the process of deciphering, and which might be summed up somewhat in these words: "You must go by line and level, and act upon the square." This, however, is not the recognised method, and Mrs. Gallup gives in her book not only "Bacon's" own account, with examples, of the "biliterie" and the "biformed" alphabets, and the method of using them, but also a long piece from "Spenser's *Complaint*" (Ed. 1591) to illustrate precisely her own manner of proceeding.

So much, then, for the "biliteral" itself. Another crop of inquiries springs up when we attempt briefly to rehearse the wonderful revelations now before us, and which it is within our power to examine and essay to prove.

Elizabeth, when princess, and prisoner in the hands of Mary, secretly married Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Of this secret marriage two sons were born. Francis the elder would have been "put away privilie" by the wicked woman whom he never could bring himself to think of as "mother." Lady Anne Bacon, however, saved his life, and under an oath of secrecy adopted him as her own son. The scene when these facts came to his knowledge, and again when they were tearfully confirmed by his "deare,"

"sweete mother," Lady Anne, are graphically described* in the cipher narrative extracted from the "*History of Henry VII.*" (Ed. 1622). Further details of the same extraordinary episode are, as may be remembered, introduced in the "word cipher," discovered, and in part published, by Dr. Owen, some seven years ago. From the disclosures made in the books deciphered, "it is evident," says Mrs. Gallup, "that Bacon expected the biliteral cipher to be the first discovered, and that it would lead to the finding of his principal or word cipher which it fully explains, and to which is intrusted the larger subjects he desired to have preserved. This order has been reversed in fact, and the earlier discovery by Dr. Owen becomes a more remarkable achievement, being entirely evolved without the aids which Bacon had prepared in this for its elucidation."

Some cryptographers believe that the several ciphers enumerated in the "*Advancement*" are embedded *one within the other*, as to some extent has been already found to be the case, the profounder kinds of ciphers being mathematical and only to be extracted by means of calculations and exact science. But to return to our story.

Francis was now sent abroad by Elizabeth's orders (*not*, as has been declared by his biographers. because Sir Nicholas Bacon wished him to see the wonders of the world abroad, but) in order to get him out of the way at the time when he had been the unwitting cause of a Court scandal. He left England in the suite of Sir Amyas Paulet, the English Ambassador. We know a little, and surmise more concerning his travels, and the places which he visited, or where he stayed studying and writing. The sad story of his ill-fated love for "My Marguerite" is briefly touched upon, rather as a thing understood to the reader than as a record, and of this more will be related in a future volume. The present extracts are from the undated 4to. of *Romeo and Juliet*, where we may read :—

"This stage-play in part will tell our brief love-tale. A part is in the Play previously nam'd or mention'd as having therein one pretty scene acted by the two. So rare and most briefe the hard-won happinesse, it affords us great content to re-live in the Play all that as mist, in summer morning did roule away. It hath place in the dramas containing a scene and theame of this nature, since our fond love

* Francis was then about 16 years of age.

interpreted th' harts o' others, and in this joy, th' joy of heaven was faintlie guessed."

In the closing lines of *King John* are these instructions:— "Join *Romeo* with *Troy*'s famous *Cressida* if you wish to know my story. Cressida in this Play with Juliet b——," which, says the Editor,* "ends the cipher in *King John* with an incomplete word. Turning to *Romeo and Juliet* (p. 53) the remainder of the word and of the broken sentence is continued, being a part of the description of Marguerite, and the love Francis entertained for her."

This love never faded from his heart, although before he married, at the age of 47, he had, he says, hung up, as it were, the picture of his love on the walls of memory. We remember the calm and uneffusive fashion in which he then imparted to his friends the news that he had found "a handsome maiden who pleased him well." The tones in which he bewailed his lost love are pitched in a different key.

"It is sometimes said, *no man can be wise and love*, and yet it would be wel to observe many will be wiser after a lesson such as wee long ago conn'd. There was noe ease to our sufferi'g heart til our yeares of life were eight lustres.† The faire face liveth ever in dreames, but in inner pleasances only doth th' sunnie vision come. This will make clearlie seene why i' the part a man doth play heerein and where-ere man's love is evident, strength hath remained unto the end—the want'n Paris recov'ring by his latter venture much previouslie lost."

A second son was born to Elizabeth, and named Robert, after his father, the Earl of Leicester. Robert was "made ward" of Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, who "died" conveniently and unexpectedly, when Robert was old enough to succeed to his title and estates. At what period the brothers became aware of their kinship has not yet been told in the cipher. Francis describes the personal beauty, gallantry, and boldness of his brother, and says that for these qualities Robert was a great favourite with the Queen who thought that he resembled herself. The tale is still incomplete; but enough has already been disclosed to give us a firm sketch of the miserable outline. We see Robert taking advantage of the Queen's doting fondness for him, and Francis endeavouring to keep his ambition within bounds, and to smooth matters with his irascible mother when, as was often the case,

* "Introduction," p. 11.

† He speaks in the third person—as a royal personage.

she became irritated beyond endurance by his arrogant audacity. The aim of Essex was, not only in the future to supplant his elder brother, but even in the Queen's lifetime to seize the crown, and rule as king. It is a dark and painful page in history, and the more we read the less we marvel at the efforts made by Elizabeth to destroy or garble the records of her own private life, and of the times in which she lived. Having spoilt and indulged Essex so long as she believed him devoted to herself, she turned upon him "in a tiger-like spirit" when his treachery became patent, and because Francis had spoken strongly on his brother's behalf, and had endeavoured to shield him from the wrath of the Queen, she punished him, by forcing him, under pain of death, to conduct the case (in his official capacity) against Essex whom she had foredoomed to execution. An allusion is made to the ring which the Queen expected Essex to send her, but which miscarried. This story has been held doubtful, but it seems as though we may find it true.

The sentence passed upon Essex was just; but the horror of the trial and the circumstances connected with the execution, haunted Francis for the rest of his life, his tender and sensitive nature, and his highly strung imagination continually reviving, whilst they shrank from, the recollection of the horrible details of which hereafter we shall have to read. Although Francis speaks in affectionate terms of his "deere" and cruelly used brother, we cannot but think that the tenderness grew out of a deep pity; for Robert had long ago proved himself a most selfish and unsatisfactory person, and a perpetual thorn in his brother's side, but, however this may have been, the gruesome tragedy remained imprinted on his soul, and clouded and embittered his whole life. "His references to the trial and execution of Essex, and the part he was forced to take in his prosecution, are the subject of a wail of unhappiness and ever-present remorse, with hopes and prayers that the truth hidden in this cipher may be found out, and published to the world in his justification.

"O God! forgiveness cometh from Thee; shut not this truest book, my God! Shut out my past—love's little sunny hour—if it soe please Thee, and some of man's worthy work; yet Essex's tragedy here shew forth; then posterity shall know him truly."*

The Queen commanded Francis to write for publication an

* *Introduction* p. 8. It seems probable that this was written soon after the events in 1601.

account of the Earl of Essex's treasons, and he did so. But the report was too lenient, too tender for the reputation of the Earl to satisfy his vindictive mother. She destroyed the document and with her own hand wrote another which was published under his name, and for which he has been held responsible. Such matters as these were State secrets, and we cannot wonder that Elizabeth should have taken care by all means in her power to prevent them from becoming public property by appearing in print. We may well believe that, as the cipher tells us, all papers were destroyed which were likely to bring dark things to light. Nevertheless much must have gradually leaked out through the actors themselves, and more must have been suspected, and only through dread of the consequences withheld from general discussion. "See what a ready tongue suspicion hath;" in private letters and hidden records the value of which is perhaps now for the first time fully understood, evidence is forthcoming to substantiate statements made in the deciphered pages of Mrs. Gallup, and her forerunner, Dr. Owen.

The matter gathered from the deciphered pages is not limited to personal or political history. For instance, speaking of the "*Anatomy of Melancholy*" (edition, 1628), the Editor says:—"The extraordinary part is that this edition conceals, in cipher, a very full and extended prose summary—*argument*, Bacon calls it—of a translation of Homer's *Iliad*. In order that there may be no mistake as to its being Bacon's works, he precedes the translation with a brief reference to his royal birth, and the wrongs he has suffered. . . . In the *De Augmentis* is found a similar extended synopsis of a translation of the *Odyssey*. This, too, is introduced with a reference to Bacon's personal history, and although the text of the book is in Latin, the cipher is in English.

The decipherer is not a Greek scholar, and would be incapable of creating these extended arguments, which differ widely in phrasing from any translation extant, and are written in a free and flowing style." *

Readers must not expect to find in this book which we are noticing, a complete and shapely narrative explaining everything, and pouring out before us the true story of our wonderful "concealed man" from beginning to end. The cipher utterances are for the most part, nothing if not fragmentary. The writer himself says so, and adds that his objects in thus trusting his secrets to the care of his friends and to the judgment

† Introduction, p. 13.

of time were First, that he might hand down to the future ages the only faithful account of himself and his history, which would ever be allowed to reach them. Secondly, he proposed to link his unacknowledged works one with another in such a way that hereafter his sons of science should from the hints given in one work be led on to another, and so to another, until the vast mass of books, Historical, Scientific, Poetical, Dramatical, Philosophical, which he wrote, should be connected, welded together like an endless chain, and the true history of the Great Restauration and of the English Renaissance fully revealed.

CHRONICLE PLAYS.—No. 5.

BACON writes:—"Princes are like heavenly bodies, which cause good or evil times, and which have much veneration, but no rest.* All precepts concerning kings, are in effect comprehended in those two remembrances:—*Memento quod es homo*,—and '*Memento quod es Deus*, or, *Vice-Dei*' (*i.e.*, 'Remember thou art man'—and 'Remember thou art God,' or *His deputy*)." (*Essays. Empire*, 1625.)

Commencing with the last sentence, to the effect, that kings are representative Gods, or Vice-regents, the Bishop of Carlisle, describes King Richard the Second:—

> And shall the figure of God's Majesty,
> *His Captain, Steward, Deputy-elect*,
> Anointed, crowned, planted many years,
> Be judged by subject and inferior breath.
> —*Rich. II.*, Act IV. i. 125.

King Henry the Sixth exclaims:—

> And therefore, by His Majesty I swear,
> *Whose far unworthy deputy I am.*
> —2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii. 285.

* Observe how the following passage, repeats this language, of the Essay upon *Empire*:—"After this manner, the foresaid instructors set before their King, *the examples of the celestial bodies*,—the sun, the moon, and the rest, which have great glory *and veneration, but no rest*, or intermission, being in a perpetual office and motion for the cherishing (in turn and in course) of inferior bodies. *Expressing likewise the true manner of the motions of Government.*" (*Persian Magic*, p. 198. *Resuscitatio*, 1661.)

> And therefore is the glorious planet *Sol*
> In noble eminence enthroned and sphered
> Amidst the other; whose medicinable eye
> Corrects the ill aspects of planets evil,
> And posts like the commandments of a king.
> —*Troilus and Cressida* I. iii.

Richard the Second says :—

> Not all the water in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed King;
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> *The deputy elected by the Lord.*
> —*Rich. II.*, Act III. ii. 55.

In his Essay *Of a King*, Bacon says :—"*A king is a mortal God on earth*, unto whom the living God hath lent His own name as a great honour; but withal told him, he should die like a man, lest he should be proud, and flatter himself that God hath with His name imparted unto him His nature also." (*Of a King.*)

This image of kings being *mortal Gods*, is frequently to be found in the Plays. In *Pericles*, we read :—

> *Kings are earth's gods; in vice their law's their will.*
> —*Pericles* I. i.

Here indeed are Bacon's words repeated :—"*Vice-Dei*" (*i.e.*, in place of God). And in various forms this finds repetition. Thus Richmond, in his prayer, before Bosworth, exclaims :—

> O thou whose Captain I account myself, etc.
> —*Rich. III.*, Act V. iii.

The consciousness of mortality by kings, (expressed in the words *Memento quod es homo*) is perfectly reflected by these words, delivered by King Henry the Fifth, just before the battle of Agincourt :—"*I think the King is but a man, as I am;* the violet smells to him as it doth to me; the element shows to him as it doth to me; *all his senses have but human conditions: his ceremonies laid by, in his nakedness he appears but a man;* and though his affections are higher mounted than ours, *they stoop with the like wing.*" (*K. Hen. V.*, Act IV. i. 104.) This speech spoken by the King, to the soldier Bates, who is ignorant of the King's identity, is uttered *in the spirit of man to man;*—it is a confession of humanlike conditions, as subsisting between the highest king, and the meanest private. And it is spoken, not only in the familiar spirit of comradeship in danger, and in arms, but outside of that disguise of *Ceremonies and Respects*, which otherwise would have hampered the King's speech. Bacon writes :—"Amongst a man's inferiors, one shall be sure of reverence; and therefore it is good a little to be familiar." (*Of Ceremonies and Respects. Essays.*)

King Richard the Second, in the extremity of his deposi-

tion by Bolingbroke, confesses to a like claim to human conditions, and common mortality, when he says:—

> For you have but mistook me all this while:
> I live with bread like you, feel want,
> Taste grief, need friends: subjected thus,
> How can you say to me, I am a king?
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act III. ii.

Bacon writes:—"Certainly great persons, had need to borrow *other men's opinions*, to think themselves happy. For if they judge by their own feelings, they cannot find it. But if they think with themselves, *what other men think of them*, and that other men, would fain be as they are, then they are happy, as it were, by report, when perhaps, they find the contrary within: for they are the first that find their own griefs, though they be the last that find their own faults." (*Of Great Place.*)

> Princes have but their titles for their glories,
> An outward honour for an inward toil;
> And, *for unfelt imagination*,
> They often feel a world of restless cares.
> So that, betwixt their titles and low names,
> There's nothing differs but the outward fame.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act I. iv. 80.

Observe how, the "*unfelt imagination*," * of the third line, answers to Bacon's "*other men's opinions;*" that is to say, the great persons, princes, or kings, *cannot find in themselves, what others think of them*, because it is "*unfelt imagination;*" imputing lack of faculty in the one, and error in the other. Somebody has observed, that almost all error of judgment, with respect to others' characters, fortunes, opportunities, and the like, entirely arise from not only lack of imagination, but from reading our own characters, views, and opinions, into other people's. That is to say, position totally changes every point of view. The vale best discovers the hill, but when we have climbed the hill, not only is the entire view altered, but the hill has in some measure disappeared. If one compares the respective values set upon attainment, and realization, by ourselves, at different ages of our lives, it is possible to understand the postulate. Indeed King Henry the Fifth is presented to us, as envying the condition of private men:—

> O hard condition,
> Twin-born with greatness, subject to the breath
> Of every fool, whose sense no more can feel

* *Henry the Sixth.*—Was never subject long'd to be a king
As I do long and wish to be a subject.
—*K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. ix.

> But his own wringing! What infinite hearts-ease
> Must kings neglect, that private men enjoy!
> —*K. Hen. V.*, Act IV. i.

Bacon writes:—"It is a miserable state of mind, to have few things to desire, *and many things to fear*. And yet that commonly is the case of *kings;* who being at the highest, want matter of desire, which makes their minds the more languishing; *and have many representations of perils and shadows*, which makes their minds the less clear." (*Empire*, 1625. *Essays*.)

What Bacon means by "*representations of perils and shadows*" is best exemplified by the representative character of King Richard the Third's *dreams*, just before the battle of Bosworth, who after the ghostly visitation of his murdered victims, exclaims:—

> By the Apostle Paul, *shadows to-night*
> *Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard*
> Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
> Armed in proof, and led by shallow Richmond.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act V. iii. 216.

The "*many things to fear*," attributed to kings' minds, by Bacon, finds almost endless echoes in the Plays. *Henry the Fourth*, complains that the cares of a king, forbid the solace of gentle sleep:—

> O thou dull God, why liest thou with the vile
> In loathsome beds, and leavest the kingly couch
> A watch case, or a common 'larum-bell?
> . . . . . .
> Deny it to a king? Then happy low, lie down!
> Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.
> —2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act III. i.

Richard the Third's Queen, describes his dreams:—

> For never yet one hour in his bed
> Have I enjoy'd the golden dew of sleep
> *But have been wak'd by his timorous dreams.*
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act IV. i.

The cares, the fears, the perils pertaining to the crown, are summed up in the speech:—

> O polish'd perturbation! Golden care!
> That keeps't the ports of slumber open wide
> To many a watchful night! etc.
> —2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act IV. v. 23.

In his Essay, *Of a King*, Bacon writes:—"A king that would not feel his crown too *heavy* for him must wear it every

day; but if he thinketh it *too light*, he knoweth not of what *metal* it is made." (*Essays. Of a King*, No. 3.)

I have little doubt, this aphorism, is pointed at King Richard the Second. This King either found the crown too heavy for him, or his character was too light to carry so grave a responsibility. Richard exclaims of the crown, which he surrenders :—

> Now mark me, how I will undo myself :
> *I give this heavyweight from off my head.*
> And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand.
> —*Rich. II.*, Act IV. i.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Give me the crown. Here, cousin, seize the crown ;
> Here cousin ;
> On this side my hand, and on that side yours.
> Now is this golden crown like a deep well
> That owes two buckets filling one another,
> *The emptier ever dancing in the air.—Ib.*

The King, according to Bolingbroke, was of a shallow, light character, *devoid of weight*, and inconsequent of the dignity which pulled him down.* The image presented to us in the above passage, *is the complete one of the balance, and the weighing in the balance.* This simile of the two buckets is, of course, borrowed from those wells, which by means of a wheel, or a beam, are so fashioned that weight in one bucket draws up the other bucket, so that whilst one is coming up, the other is going down the well. This theory, as applied to Richard the Second, is indorsed by the aphorism, which follows, on the steps, of the one cited. "He must make religion *the rule of government, and not to balance the scale ;* for *he that casteth in religion only to make the scales even*, his own weight is contained in those characters, 'Mene, mene, tekel Upharsin.' *He is found too light,* † *his kingdom shall be taken from him.*" (*Of a King*, No. 4.)

* Cardinal Wolsey exclaims of Anne Boleyn :—

> There was the weight that pulled me down.—Act III. ii. (?)

† The Court of Richard the Second was the most foppish that England had ever seen. The King, who was the greatest fop of the day, had a coat estimated at 30,000 marks. He seems to have thought that his whole life was to be one of gaiety, splendour, and pleasure. His wanton extravagance was prodigal. He kept two thousand cooks, and when he celebrated his Christmas at Westminster Hall the daily consumption was twenty-eight oxen, three hundred sheep. When he came to the Crown, the city fountains were made to flow with wine, and the year after, at his coronation, four different sorts of wines were made to flow through the public channels. One of the coats ordered to be made, was embroidered with letters, leaves, and flowers, and thickly studded with precious stones, and cost as much as £80,000 of our

In this same Essay *Of a King*, "*His greatest enemies are his flatterers; for though they ever speak on his side, yet their words still make against him.*" * (No. 14.)

In his Essay upon *Empire*, Bacon writes upon the *tragedies, and dangers accruing to kings, from their wives, and from their children.* "For their wives, there are cruel examples of them (*Crudelia et atrocia*). *Livia is infamed for the poisoning of her husband* (Augusti—of Augustus). Roxolana, Solyman's wife, was the destruction of that renowned prince, Sultan Mustapha, and otherwise troubled his house and succession. Edward the Second of England, his Queen, had the principal hand, *in the deposing and murder of her husband.* This kind of danger is then to be feared, chiefly, when the wives have plots, for the raising of their own children (*Liberos ex priore marito*—Children by a former husband), *or else that they be adultresses.*" (*Empire. Essays*, 1625.)

King Richard the Second, *who was deposed, and murdered*, seems to have been following a similar train of thought, when he soliloquises thus :—

> For God's sake, *let us sit upon the ground*
> *And tell sad stories of the death of kings.* †
> How some have been *deposed;* some slain in war;
> Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed;
> *Some poison'd by their wives;* some sleeping kill'd;
> *All murder'd.*—*K. Rich. II.*, Act III. ii.

In pondering the passage from Bacon, upon the dangers accruing to kings from their wives, and particularly the case of Livia, who poisoned her husband; the mind is immediately held by the parallel presented, by the poisoning of the King in *Hamlet*, at the hands of his wife, and her paramour Claudius. The Play does not directly tell us what hand Gertrude had in the immediate death (while sleeping in his orchard) of the King, but indirectly she was privy to it, *as she was an adultress.* To use Bacon's words—(applied to Edward the Second's Queen), the Queen in *Hamlet* "*had the principal hand in the murder and deposing of her husband.*" So again, Margaret, Queen to King Henry the Sixth, was undoubtedly mistress to the Duke of Suffolk, and by her intrigues managed

money. To minister to this extravagance a poll tax of one shilling was levied upon every male and female above fifteen years of age. This tax produced the *seditious troubles* of Wat Tyler and Jack Straw.

* The Play of *Richard the Second* was probably inspired by *the Comedy of Eupolis*, called *The Flatterers*, and acted in the third year of the 89th Olympiad.

† Compare :—"Many kings have *sat down upon the ground;* and one that was never thought of, hath worn the crown." (Ecclesiasticus xl. 5.)

to bring the protector Gloucester to his fall and end, thus weakening and troubling her husband King Henry the Sixth's reign and stability. Suffolk exclaims:—

> Margaret shall now be Queen, and rule the King;
> But I will rule both her, the King and realm.
> 1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. v.

The Essay upon *Empire*, contains this passage upon kings: "*For their prelates, when they are proud and great, there is also danger* * *from them.* As it was in the time of Anselm, and Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, who with their croziers did almost try it with the King's sword." (*Empire*, 1625.)

Bacon seems to have imitated Plutarch's system of writing parallel lives, in these hints for characters in the Plays. For example, Henry Beaufort, first Bishop of Winchester, (and finally made Cardinal), played a great part in the history of King Henry the Sixth. He is portrayed in the Play, *as a prelate both proud and great*, and dangerous to the King.

> *Gloucester.*—No, *prelate*, such is thy audacious wickedness,
> Thy lewd, pestiferous, and dissentious pranks,
> *As very infants prattle of thy pride.*
> . . . . . .
> Beside, I fear me, if thy thoughts were sifted
> The King, thy sovereign, is not quite exempt
> From envious malice of thy swelling heart.
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i.

It was this prelate who murdered Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, and thus deprived the King of his best defence and support, his true counsellor and protector. After he was created Cardinal, Exeter exclaimed of his ambition:—

> What! Is my lord of Winchester install'd,
> And call'd unto a Cardinal's degree?

* "The danger is not from that state (*Prælatis*) *but where it hath a dependence of foreign authority.*" This was exactly the case of Cardinal Wolsey, who was not only a dependent of the popes, (*Empire*, 1625) but was in league with the Emperor Charles:—

> *Buck.*—Charles the Emperor,
> Under pretence to see the Queen his aunt,—
> For 'twas indeed his colour, *but he came*
> To whisper Wolsey.
> . . . . . .
> Let the King know,
> As soon as he shall by me, that thus the Cardinal
> Does buy and sell his honour as he pleases,
> And for his own advantage.
> —*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act I. i. 176.

Then I perceive that will be verified
Henry the Fifth did sometime prophesy,
If once he come to be a cardinal,
He'll make his cap co-equal with the crown.
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. i. 28.

His intentions were dangerous to the young King, during his minority :—

Winches'er.—I am left out; for me nothing remains,
But long I will not be Jack out of office.
The King from Eltham I intend to steal
And sit at chiefest stern of public weal.
—*Ib.*, Act III. i. 174.

It is of this Cardinal, Gloucester says :—

Arrogant Winchester, *that haughty prelate,*
Whom Henry, our late sovereign, ne'er could brook?
Thou art no friend to God or to the King.
—*Ib.*, Act I. iii. 23.

And the Mayor of London, describes him as—

This Cardinal's more haughty than the devil.—*Ib.*

Another prelate, *both proud and great, and also dangerous to his king*, was Cardinal Wolsey. The following passage seems to be pointed at him, which I take from the Essay upon *Riches* :—"As Solomon saith ;—'*Riches are as a stronghold in the imagination of the rich man.*' (Prov. xviii. 2). But this is excellently expressed, that it is in imagination, and not always in fact. *For certainly great riches, have sold more men, than they have bought out. Seek not proud riches,* but such as thou may'st get justly, use soberly, distribute cheerfully, and leave contentedly." (*Essays. Riches*, 1625.)

Now, in the Play of *King Henry the Eighth*, it will be found, *that it was the inventory of his great, and enormous riches, falling by accident into the King's hands, that undid, and indeed sold Cardinal Wolsey!* Moreover, these riches, which included Hampton Court, are described in the Play, as *proud riches*, that is, they were part of the pomp and pride of the great Cardinal. The King exclaims :—

King.—This morning
Papers of State he sent me to peruse
As I required : and wot you what I found
There,—on my conscience, put unwittingly?
Forsooth, an inventory thus importing;
The several parcels of his plate, his treasure,
Rich stuffs, and ornaments of household; *which*
I find at such proud rate, that it outspeaks
Possession of a subject.

The King gives Wolsey, this inventory to read, and the

latter immediately divines his own fall, from the mischance:—

Wolsey.—'Tis so
This paper has undone me, 'tis the account
Of all that world of wealth I have drawn together
For mine own ends; indeed to gain the popedom
And see my friends in Rome. *
—*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act III. ii. 120–209.

Wolsey's pride and ambition were so great, that one of the charges brought against him was—

That out of mere ambition, you have caused
Your holy hat to be stamp'd on the King's coin.
—Act III. 2.

"Above all, those are most subject to envy, which carry the greatness of their fortunes, in an insolent and proud manner. Being never well, but while they are showing, how great they are, either by outward pomp, or by triumphing over all opposition, or competition." (*Envy. Essays*, 1625.)

In his Essay upon *Empire*, Bacon writes of kings:—"For their *nobles*, to keep them at a distance (*Sunt illi certe cohibendi, et tanquam in justa distantia a solio Regali continendi;* —they ought assuredly to be restrained, and kept as it were at a proper distance from the King's throne). But to depress them, may make a king more absolute, but less safe, and less able to perform anything that he desires." (*Empire*, 1625.)

Bacon then cites King Henry the Seventh, as an example of a king "who depressed the nobility,"—"whereupon it came to pass, that his times were full of difficulties, and troubles." (*Ib.*) Richard the Second undoubtedly lost his crown by depressing Bolingbroke, and in confiscating his estates and those

* Cardinal Wolsey was a man of prodigious ambition and love of show. His train consisted of five hundred servants, many of whom were knights and sons of noblemen. A priest went before him carrying a pillar of silver, surmounted with a cross, and noblemen-ushers cleared the way crying, "Make way for my Lord's Grace." His vest was of gold and silk; a robe of scarlet cloth adorned his shoulders; and he held a sponge to his nose, lest the breath of the common people should offend him. He rode upon a mule, trapped with crimson velvet and gold. At his banquets dukes and earls served him with wines; and bishops or abbots held him a basin in which to rinse his hands. Wolsey's pride and ambition soared to such a height that he became known by the epithet "*King Cardinal.*" The Duke of Norfolk charged him with giving himself precedence of the King;—

Then, that in all you writ to Rome, or else
To foreign princes '*Ego et Rex meus*'
Was still inscrib'd; in which you brought the King
To be your servant.
—*Hen. VIII.*, Act III. ii. 314.

of John of Gaunt, his father. King Henry the Fourth, kept his most powerful nobles, particularly the Percies (who had helped him to the throne), at so great a distance, that they rebelled against the King, under Hotspur. The King exclaims to the Earl of Worcester :—

> Worcester, get thee gone, for I do see
> Danger, and disobedience in thine eye.
> O, sir, your presence is too bold and peremptory,
> And Majesty might never yet endure
> The moody frontier of a servant's brow.
> —1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. iii.

This distance of the King's, brought about the difficulties, seditions and troubles, of the rising of Worcester, Hotspur, and Douglas, which ended by the defeat of the latter, at the battle of Shrewsbury. The complaint Worcester brought against the King, was, just this *keeping of his nobles at a distance*, Bacon speaks of, in relation to kings :—

> *Worcester.*—For, bear ourselves as even as we can,
> The King will always think him in our debt,
> And think we think ourselves unsatisfied,
> Till he hath found a time to pay us home.
> *And see already how he doth begin,*
> *To make us strangers to his looks of love.*
> —1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. iii. 285.

Bacon writes : "So man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon *Divine Protection* and favour, gathereth a force, and faith, which human nature in itself could not obtain." (*Atheism.*)

In the description of King Henry the Fifth's piety, we read :—

> *Being free from vainness*, and self-glorious pride,
> Giving full trophy, signal and ostent,
> Quite from himself to God.
> —*K. Hen. V.*, Act V. i.

The Bible tells us, "*Man fell from vanity.*" The lightness, or vanity of Richard the Second is compared to the fall :—

> What Eve, what serpent, hath suggested thee,
> *To make a second fall of cursed man?*
> Why dost thou say King Richard is deposed?
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act III. iv.

In his Essay upon *Counsel*, Bacon writes :—"The inconveniences that have been noted in calling and using counsels, are three. First *the revealing of affairs whereby they become less secret.*" (*Counsel.*)

Hastings.—Bid him not fear the separated councils.
His honour and myself are at the one,
And at the other is my servant Catesby;
Where nothing can proceed that toucheth us
Whereof I shall not have intelligence.
—*Rich. III.*, Act III. 2.

Bacon, continuing the inconveniences of Counsels, says:—"Thirdly, the danger of being unfaithfully counselled, and more for the good of them that counsel than of him that is counselled" (*Principis ipsius: i.e.*, the prince himself. Latin Ed., 1638). (*Counsel*, 1625.)

Prince.—Say, uncle Gloucester, if our brother come,
Where shall we sojourn till our coronation?
Gloucester.—Where it seems best unto your royal self.
If I may counsel you, some day or two.
Your highness shall repose you at the tower.
—*Rich. III.*, Act III. 1.

This *counsel* of Richard the Third's was given expressly to the Prince, in order to get the brothers into his clutches. They were both murdered by Dighton and Forest in the Tower. Lord Hastings was betrayed by his servant Catesby, to Richard the Third. In short, while pretending to play the spy for his master, he was in Richard's pay.

Bacon writes:—"There is a kind of followers, likewise, which are dangerous, *being indeed espials*, which inquire the secrets of the house, and bear tales of them to others." (*Followers and Friends.*)

The Dukes of Buckingham were both betrayed by such followers, or espials:—

Buckingham.— Both
Fell by our servants, by those men we loved most
A most unnatural, or faithless service.
—*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act II. ii.

Compare:—

. . . . . .

The princes' *espials* have informed me
How the English, in the suburbs, close entrenched,
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act I. iv.

"Besides Counsellors are not commonly so united, but that one Counsellor *keepeth sentinel over another.*" (*Essays. Counsel*, 1625.) This conceit of jealousy *acting as sentinel*, finds its reflection in the poem of *Venus and Adonis*:—

For where love reigns, disturbing jealousy
Doth call himself affection's *sentinel*.—649.

"Solomon hath pronounced that in '*counsel* is stability.'

Things will have their first, or second agitation; if they be not tossed upon the arguments of counsel, *they will be tossed upon the waves of Fortune; and be full of inconstancy, doing and undoing like the reeling of a drunken man.*" (*Counsel. Essays*, 1625.)

Observe the double imagery, first of the waves of Fortune, next of the drunken man, both probably being borrowed from the Psalm: "For at His word the stormy wind ariseth, *they reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man.* And are at their wit's end." (*Psalm* cvii. 25—28.)

The entire moral of this Psalm is, that men should not put their trust in princes, or in their fellow-men, but in the Almighty, who alone is able to deliver them in time of trouble. Lord Hastings, who, be it closely observed, had been wisely *counselled* by Stanley to fly, refused, and was betrayed by his servant Catesby. He would not believe that he was in danger, but thought himself "*secure in grace and favour*" with the King. After the order of his execution, Hastings exclaims:—

> O momentary grace of mortal men,
> Which we more hunt for than the grace of God!
> Who builds his hopes in air of your good looks,
> *Lives like a drunken sailor on a mast,*
> Ready with every nod to tumble down
> Into the fatal bowels of the deep.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act III. iv.

The identity of the parallel, finds confirmation in Catesby's reply to Hastings, in the second scene:—

> *Hastings.*—Good morrow, Catesby; you are early stirring:
> What news, what news, in this our tottering State?
> *Catesby.*—*It is a reeling world, indeed my lord;*
> And I believe 'twill never stand upright
> Till Richard wear the garland of the realm.
> —Act III. ii.

A little more may be understood of this image of the *reeling, or tottering of the State*, when Bacon observes:—"For without that ballast the ship will roll too much," said of favourites, and nobles, who are to balance each other. (*Ambition.*) "And certainly the more a man drinketh of the world the more it intoxicateth." (*Essays. Youth and Age.*)

The Duchess of York exclaims of her sons:—

> And often up and down my sons were tossed.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act II. iv. 58.

In which image, Fortune is conceived as a ship, and the State also as a vessel, which carries the Fortunes, so to speak.

Wolsey describes himself as, "an old man broken with the storms of State" (*K. Henry VIII.* IV. ii.), in which something of the same image is implied.

Bacon says:—"Libels and licentious discourses against the State, when they are frequent and open, and in like sort *false news often running up and down*, to the disadvantage of the State, and hastily embraced, are amongst the signs of troubles." (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

> I find the people strangely fantasied,
> Possess'd with rumours, full of idle dreams,
> *Not knowing what they fear, but full of fear.*
> —*K. John* IV. ii.

"They are the most dangerous *discontentments*, where the fear is greater than the feeling. *Dolendi modus, timendi non item.* [There is measure in suffering, but not in fear]." (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

> *K. John.*—Our discontented counties do revolt,
> Our people quarrel with obedience,
> Swearing allegiance and the love of soul
> To stranger blood, to foreign royalty.
> —*K. John* V. i.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Now powers from France and *discontents* at home
> Meet in one line.—*Ib.*, IV. iii. 151.

"Reverence is that wherewith princes are *girt* from God, who threateneth the dissolving thereof. *Solvam cingula regum.*" (*Seditions and Troubles*).

> Now happy he whose cloak and *cincture* can
> Hold out this *tempest.*—*John* IV. iii.

The State is always likened unto a ship, in the Chronicle Plays. King Henry the Sixth exclaims:—

> Thus stands my State, 'twixt Cade and York distress'd;
> *Like to a ship that having scap'd a tempest,*
> Is straightway calm'd, and boarded by a pirate.
> —*2 K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. ix.

So likewise Bacon, in the Essay of *The True Greatness of Kingdoms* speaks of those, "*Who manage the helm of affairs.* (*Rerum gubernacula tractant*)." Compare:—

> And you yourself shall steer the happy helm.
> —*2 K. Hen. VI.*, I. iii.

So likewise the *tide is compared to Fortune, in its ebbing and flowing:*—

> *Northumberland.*—
> 'Tis with my mind

As with the tide swell'd up unto its height,
That makes a still stand, running neither way.
—2 *K. Hen. IV.*, II. iii.

Bacon says:—"When a State grows to an overpower, *it is like a great flood, that will be sure to overflow.*" (*Essays. Vicissitude of Things*).

The ocean, overpeering of his list
Eats not the flats with more impetuous haste
Than young Laertes, in a riotous head,
O'erbears your officers.—*Hamlet* IV. v.

"Then is the danger, when the greater sort do but wait, *for the troubling of the waters, amongst the meaner, that then they may declare themselves.*" (*Essays. Seditions and Troubles*).

This was exactly what Richard Plantagenet did;—who stirred up Jack Cade, to rebellion, so as to declare himself. The people are the *waters* in the metaphor, and they are put into agitation, or trouble, by the *greater sort*—by nobles, orators, men who possess powers of stirring up others.

Duke of York.—I will stir up in England some black *storm.*

. . . . . .

And, for a minister of my intent
I have seduced a headstrong Kentishman,
John Cade of Ashford.—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, III. i. 349.

So in like manner Pandulph exclaims:—

It was my breath that blew this *tempest* up,
Upon your stubborn usage of the pope.
—*John*, Act V. i.

"So when any of the four pillows of government are unduly shaken (which are religion, justice, counsel, and treasure), men had need to pray for *fair weather.*" (*Seditions and Troubles*).

It will be noticed that Bacon's Essay, *Seditions and Troubles*, evidently derived its title from the *sedition* of the factions of Somerset and York, which lost France to England, and led to the Civil War of the Roses:—

Lucy.—Thus while the *vulture of sedition*
Feeds in the bosom of such great commanders,
Sleeping neglection doth betray to loss
The conquest of our scarce cold conqueror,
That ever living man of memory,
Henry the Fifth.—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. iii.

Bacon writes:—"Also that kind of obedience, which Tacitus speaketh of, is to be held suspected: *Erant in officio, sed tamen qui mallent mandata imperantium interpretari, quam*

exequi—disputing, excusing, cavilling upon mandates and directions, is a kind of shaking off the yoke, and assay of disobedience; especially if in those disputings they which are for the direction speak fearfully and tenderly, and those that are against it audaciously." (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

Henry the Sixth gave his *mandate* to the Duke of Somerset to unite his troops to those of the Duke of York, in order to go to the assistance of Talbot, who was hard pushed by the French. Henry the Sixth's orders were not obeyed by Somerset, who makes excuses:—

> *Somerset.*—It is too late, I cannot send them now.
> This expedition was by York and Talbot
> Too rashly plotted.—Act IV. iv.

Somerset and York were both in office, the one Regent of France, the other commanding troops going to Talbot's aid. York exclaims:—

> A plague upon that villain Somerset,
> That thus delays my promised supply
> Of horsemen, that were levied for this siege!
> . . . . . .
> Maine, Blois, Poictiers, and Tours are won away,
> *Long all of Somerset and his delay.*
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. iii.

Thus France was entirely lost owing to the pernicious disobedience of Somerset, who was jealous of York, and audacious to his king. The King of France confesses that "had York and Somerset brought rescue in, we should have found a bloody day of this." (1 *K. Henry VI.* IV. vii.)

Lucy exclaims to Somerset:—

> You, his false hopes, the trust of England's honour,
> Keep off aloof with worthless *emulation*.
> Let not your private discord keep away
> The levied succours that should lend him aid.
> —*Ib.*, Act IV. iv.

Bacon writes of delays:—"There is surely no greater wisdom than well to time the beginnings, and onsets of things." Again: "Nay, it were better to meet some dangers half way, though they come nothing near, than to keep too long watch upon their approaches." (*Delays. Essays.*) The King is made to speak, "*fearfully and tenderly*," in giving his mandate to those in office. It is an expostulation, or apology, rather than an imperious order:—

> *King.*—If they perceive dissension in our looks,
> And that within ourselves we disagree:

> Besides, what infamy will then arise,
> When foreign princes shall be certified
> That, for a toy, a thing of no regard,
> King Henry's peers, and chief nobility,
> *Destroy'd themselves, and lost the realm of France.*
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. i.

"It is commonly seen that men once placed *taken in with the contrary faction to that by which they enter :* thinking belike, that they have the first sure, and now are ready, for a new purchase. *The traitor in faction* lightly goeth away with it, for when matters have stuck long in balancing, the winning of some one man casteth them, and he getteth all the thanks." (*Faction. Essays.*) This is exactly what that traitor in faction, the Duke of Burgundy, did :—

> I have, upon especial cause,
> Moved with compassion of my country's wreck,
> Together with the pitiful complaints
> Of such as your oppression feeds upon,
> *Forsaken your pernicious faction,*
> *And join'd with Charles, the rightful King of France.*
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. i. 55.

Bacon's Essay upon *Nemesis* says of her :—"She is called the daughter of Night and Ocean ; her figure is described—'She was winged, and wore a crown ; she bore in her right hand an ashen spear, in her left a phial, in which Æthiops were confined, and was mounted on a deer.' The allegory seems to be thus explained : The name *Nemesis* signifies manifestly enough, *Vengeance, or Retribution ;* for the office, and ministry of this goddess, consisted in this, that she should interpose her veto, *like a tribune of the people,* against the constant and unvarying prosperity of the fortunate ; and not only chastise insolence, but pay off prosperity even though moderate, and innocently acquired, *with alternate seasons of adversity.* The parents of this goddess, *were Ocean and Night, that is the Vicissitude of Things,* and the obscure and secret counsels of God ; for changes of things are aptly represented by the ocean, *in his everlasting flux and reflux, and occult Providence, is well designated by night.*" (*Nemesis, or the Mutability of Things. Wisdom of the Ancients.*)

The mutability of things, particularly of national glory, or the flow and ebb of the tides of conquest and loss abroad, are strikingly illustrated in the successive reigns of King Henry the Fifth, and his son Henry the Sixth. Everything almost, the former king won by force of arms, abroad in France, the latter lost again. There was a prophecy :—

That Henry, born at Monmouth, should win all;
And Henry, born at Windsor, lose all.
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i.

Now we have just heard Bacon, ascribing these Vicissitudes of Fortune to Ocean and *Night*. Mark the opening of the first part of the Play of *King Henry the Sixth,—the stress laid upon Night*:—

Bedford.—Hung be the heavens with black, yield day to night!
Comets, importing change of times and states,
Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky,
And with them scourge the bad revolting stars
That have consented unto Henry's death!
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, I. i.

And that this mourning does not only apply to the death of the King, but also to other things, may be seen in Exeter's reply:—

We mourn in black; why mourn we not in blood?

Bacon writes:—"Comets, out of question, have likewise power and effect, over the gross and mass of things; but they are rather gazed upon, and waited upon in their journey, than wisely observed in their effects." (*Vicissitude of Things. Essays.*)

It was during the military operations of Talbot in France, that the *national Nemesis*, or vicissitude of conquest, occurred in the loss of all that King Henry the Fifth, had gained in France. Well, therefore is this goddess coupled with his name:—

Is Talbot slain, the Frenchmen's only scourge,
Your kingdom's terror, *and black Nemesis?*
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. vii.

In Bacon's metaphor comparing the vicissitude of things *to the flow and ebb of the tides*, we have an image abundantly reflected in the Plays, both for public and private Fortune. Bacon writes:—"It is likewise to be remembered, that, forasmuch as the increase of any estate must be upon the foreigner (for whatsoever is somewhere gotten, is somewhere lost), there be but three things which one nation selleth unto another: the commodity as nature yieldeth it; the manufacture; and the vecture, or carriage; so that if these three wheels go, *wealth will flow as in a springtide.*" (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

Bacon writes:—"Nor is it to be wondered at, that Icarus perish'd by excess. For excess is usually *the vice of youth*, defect that of old age. Yet of two bad and dangerous paths

he chose the better, for the defects are reckoned the most depraved, *since in excess there is some magnanimity shown*, and sound affinity to heaven as in a bird. Defect crawls on the ground like a reptile." (*Scylla and Icarus. Wisdom of Ancients.*)

King Henry the Sixth exclaims of his son, Edward Prince of Wales :—

> I, Dædalus; *my poor boy Icarus;*
> Thy father, Minos, that denied our course;
> The sun that seared the wings of my sweet boy,
> Thy brother Edward.—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. vi.

This speech is uttered to Gloucester (afterwards Richard the Third). The gallant young prince, who was slain by the latter, undoubtedly brought on his own death by his bold, daring, and fearless disposition. In Scene 5 of Act V. of this Play, we find him calling Richard, Duke of Gloucester, "this scolding crookback," and ordering him to be taken away. In short, the *excess* of his reckless courage, in defying King Edward the Fourth's authority, which he refuses to acknowledge, excites admiration, but foreboding of his fate. When his dauntless mother, Margaret of Anjou, rallies him, to fight for the crown, he replies :—

> Methinks a woman of this valiant spirit
> Should, if a coward heard her speak these words,
> *Infuse his breast with magnanimity*,
> And make him, naked, foil a man at arms.
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. iv. 39.

Here is the *magnanimity* Bacon connotes with the *excess* of a youthful, gallant, and ambitious spirit, that knows no fear, *in soaring too close to the sun.* Edward the Fourth was that kingly sun, and like Icarus, Prince Edward dared too close to the power that consumed him—*i.e.*, the House of York. Bacon writes, in the same Essay: "But the road between Scylla and Charybdis doth certainly require both skill and good Fortune *in sailings.* For if the *ships* fall on Scylla, they are dashed to pieces on the *rocks;* if on Charybdis, they are swallowed up." (*Scylla and Charybdis, or the Middle Way. Wisdom of Ancients.*)

Compare Margaret's speech to this prince, in which he is compared to the *pilot of the ship of State*, and his enemies are fatal rocks, quicksands, and seas :—

> We will not from the helm to sit and weep,
> But keep our course, though the rough wind say no,
> From shelves and rocks, that threaten us with wreck.
> As good to chide the waves as speak them fair.

And what is Edward but a ruthless sea?
What Clarence but a quicksand of deceit?
And Richard but a ragged fatal rock?
All these the enemies to our poor bark.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. iv.

Bacon writes:—"*So the poets in tragedies*, do make the most passionate lamentations, and those that forerun final despair, *to be accusing, questioning, and torturing of a man's self.*" [Quod quis culpa sua contraxit, majus malum; quod ab exterius imponitur, minus malum]. (*Colours of Good and Evil.*)

Cardinal Beaufort, who had a chief hand in the murdering of good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, tortures himself thus on his deathbed:—

Bring me unto my trial when you will.
Died he not in his bed? Where should he die?
Can I make men live, whether they will or no?
O, torture me no more! I will confess.
Alive again? Then show me where he is.
I'll give a thousand pound to look upon him.
He hath no eyes, the dust hath blinded them.
Comb down his hair; look, look! It stands upright
Like limetwigs set to catch my winged soul.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. iii. 8–18.

Observe in this passage, the *questioning*, as well as the *torturing*, and implied *accusing*. In exactly the same *self-torturing strain*, the King, in *Hamlet*, exclaims of himself:—

O bosom black as death!
O limed soul that, struggling to be free
Art more engaged.—*Hamlet* III. iii.

Richard the Third, in his speech commencing:

I am a villain: yet I lie, I am not.
Fool, of thyself speak well: fool, do not flatter.
My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
And every tongue brings in a several tale,
And every tale condemns me for a villain.
—*Rich. III.*, Act V. iii.

In his Essay upon *Cunning* Bacon writes:—"It is strange, how long some men will lie in wait, to speak somewhat, they desire to say; *and how far about they will fetch;* and how many other matters they will beat over to come near it. It is a thing of great patience, but yet of much use." (*Cunning. Essays*, 1625.) Stanley *beats about the bush*, in exactly this way, when he comes to announce Richmond's invasion, to King Richard the Third:—

K. Richard.—Hey-day, a riddle! neither good nor bad!

Why dost thou run so many mile about
When thou may'st tell thy tale a nearer way?
Once more, what news?
—*K. Rich. III.* Act IV. iv. 459.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

"FEIGNED LIVES."

FRA. PIETRO PAULO SARPI AND JOSEPH MEDE.

WE return to the subject of Feigned Lives or Feigned Histories, opened in a previous paper,* and give as the next example the Life of Fra. Pietro Paulo or Paulo Sarpi, a man of whom the majority of readers know nothing, but who by students of his history and accredited works is highly esteemed. Those who would follow this study are commended to the works of his biographer, Fulgentius, a divine of the Republic of Venice, with whom, as we know, Francis Bacon was in correspondence as late as 1625.

The "History of the Council of Trent" is the work by which the name of Paulo Sarpi chiefly lives; but we must take notice that "*his fame as a historian is posthumous, and the authorship of the History was never acknowledged by him.*" † The indubitable facts of his life are as follow:—He was born in Venice, 1552. His parents and relations were of the middle class, and connected by family ties with the Church of Rome. He owed his education to his uncle, Ambrosio Morelli, and from childhood he was brought up in the convent of the Servites, or Servi di Maria, a Florentine order founded in the 13th century. For fifteen years of his life he was, as Galileo complained, "always at the Doge's palace, serving tables." To the last day of his life he was considered by the Venetian Magnificoes as a useful "*instrument;*" for, however they might acknowledge their obligation to him, they never forgot that he was but a poor Friar, with no pretensions. He was a firm Catholic, but strenuously opposed the Spanish-Jesuit policy, which he held to be the root of evil in the Church, and he spent his life in combating them and their methods. He died in 1623.

So much for the leading facts of the life of the man himself. Let us now turn to the account of his studies, works, faculties,

* BACONIANA, July, 1900. † *Quarterly Review*, April, 1893, p. 373.

inventions, and experiments described by his biographer, Fulgentius, and by all later writers,* premising, however, that in all probability Fra Paulo did possess some share of the brilliant qualities, or, at least, of the industry and love of study attributed to him. To suppose the following a true account of him would be to assume that one as great and as profoundly acquainted with the science which Francis enumerated amongst the "deficiences" in learning, was living, and beginning to supply these very deficiences ten years before Francis began to write of them. The following words need but a change of name faithfully to describe Francis "Bacon:"—

"Young Sarpi was from the first a student and a thinker. He did not care for games, was much alone . . . so retired and modest that his companions called him *La Sposa*; but he so commanded their respect that no unseemly language was ever heard in his presence. . . . A devourer of books, he showed a universal capacity, surpassing his teachers in mathematics, in experimental science, in language, in logic, metaphysics, law, divinity.

"His intellectual power chiefly displayed itself in ease and certainty of apprehension and infallible retentiveness of memory. He saw into intricate problems at once, and never forgot what he had once comprehended. His studies were so comprehensive that one branch helped another; and as he was never superficial, so was he never narrow. The slightest acquaintance with his works will convince the reader of his power to concentrate on one subject the experience gained in others. The exactitude gained in scientific experiment is not laid aside when he approaches a historical theme, and the wide range of his historical knowledge is felt in the breadth of the grounds upon which he argues.

"As a boy and youth, he made such astonishing progress in learning that, at the age of 18, he was a professor of half-a-dozen sciences, and at the age of 54 he was known throughout Europe as one of the first scholars of the age, and corresponded on equal terms with the leaders of thought in every branch of science and letters. . . . He made himself acquainted with several Oriental languages. He got at his fingers' ends all Church history, and much of universal history. He studied all the ancient authors, especially the historians; . . . made himself master of the Canon, and with use and custom of *Venetian* law. . . . But his favourite

* See "Fra. Paulo Sarpi," by the Rev. Alex. Robertson (1883).

study was that of physical science. In his cell he carried out an infinite variety of experiments in optics, astronomy, hydraulics, anatomy, medicine, chemistry, botany, mineralogy. He studied the transmutation of metals . . . the best spirits of the day, Porta, Fabricius, Galileo, all confessed obligations to him in the course of their discoveries . . .

"Few men have had so much attributed to them as Father Paul.* He has been accredited with discoveries concerning the valves of the heart, and the circulation of the blood, which anticipated those of Cesalpini and Harvey. . . . He observed the contractility of the iris of the eye, and it is possible that he foresaw the invention (it is certain that he understood the importance) of the telescope and the thermometer. . . . He wrote treatises on the tides and the motion of water, on projectiles, on the war engines of the ancients, demonstrating before Buffon the probability of Archimedes' burning glasses; and we may receive these accounts with respect when we remember that he would accept no conclusions in natural history which he had not himself verified by experiment. In mathematics he had few equals. . . . It is said he read mathematics every day of his life, that he criticised, completed, and corrected as a master, and improved "Vieta's Treatise on Algebra." † . . . His genius in mechanics was such that he would immediately divine the use and perceive the imperfections of any instrument brought to him. He used experiment in every thing; never contented with a result till he had interrogated nature upon it, nor with any result that was not his own. It is no discredit to his humanity that he saw no objection to experiments upon living animals; it is rather to his credit that in his later years he expressed some compunction on this score.

"It would have been satisfactory if the results of Father Paul's experiments had been preserved. Much of what he wrote perished by fire, much remains in MS. and will never be published. What he contributed to the sum of human knowledge must therefore remain doubtful."

(We pause here to point out that here is another instance in which—like Alciati, Ashmole, Barthius, Camden, Cowley, Harvey, Leland, Usher, Withers, Anthony Wood, and others—the MSS. necessary to prove the statements of the

* We are obliged to omit references to the voluminous polemical and theological works attributed to the Friar.

† Bianchi Giovini i. 78.

biographer were burnt or otherwise destroyed. Why, we also ask, and by what authority, are the many remains of "Paulo Sarpi's" MSS. *never to be* published? Where are they? Are the historians themselves to be debarred from an inspection of documents so much to their purpose?)

The biographer continues the remark that Sarpi's contribution to the sum of human knowledge by saying that "it was probably more than will be put down to him, both because of the loss of his works, and *because he never kept his knowledge to himself, but let it bear fruit in the minds of the friends with whom he conversed.*"

"It was characteristic of Fra. Paulo, as it has been of a very few great men, that *he never desired his name to be connected with the inventions or discoveries which he made. Hence it is that much of his fame passed to his contemporaries, whom he never could regard as rivals; and that, while he is obscurely credited with some of the greatest discoveries of the time, none can be conspicuously assigned to him.*

"He had none of the jealousy which made Henri Estienne close the doors of his library to Casaubon. What Fra. Paulo knew was his own *et amicorum.* 'Like God and Nature,' he would say, 'let us give, not lend.' He was holden for *a miracle* in all manner of knowledge, divine and human, yet not a monster of memory, for all with him was orderly.*

"Space fails us to do more than catalogue the various interests and attainments of this wonderful man. He was well read in Hebrew and Chaldee, and familiar with Rabbinical studies, as his table-talk showed. His knowledge of law is confirmed by the fact that none of his decisions . . . were ever reversed; they did not admit of reply. . . . Never was anything proposed to him whereto he did not as readily and solidly give an answer, as if it had been his only profession, and yet he gave no resolution nor answer so suddenly that it seemed not to be most studiously considered of, and such a one as it was impossible to be bettered. . . . In another field of thought his '*Arte di ben pensare,*' *now lost,*† is said to have been founded on the principle that 'Sense never deceives,' and to have anticipated something of Locke's doctrine of the association of ideas."

The historian argues from the omission of art, poetry, and the belles lettres from the records of Fra. Paulo, that he knew

* In short, he had a method—set everything down in writing and orderly notes.

† Fr. P. Sarpi. Letter xxviii.

little about them, and probably this is true of the good Friar, though not of the true experimental philosopher. On the other hand, we are told that he formed himself as historian upon Thucydides, Xenophon, and Livy, and knew the mediæval chroniclers as well as the Italian historians. His own style (he said) was more robust than theirs, and *all his own*. "I write," he said, "what comes uppermost, and *often break Priscian's head with my pen*."

Again, we halt for a moment to remind readers of the use of the remarkable figure put in italics, which is made in the works of other "feigned authors" besides Sarpi.

"*Sir Thos. Browne*" says in the *Religio Medici* (Part II., Sec. ii.):—

"How do grammarians hack and slash for the genitive case in Jupiter, Jovis, or Jupitris? How do they *break their own pates* to salve that of Priscian?"

In "Verses to Sir Kenelm Digby," signed *Iohn Serjeant*, the supposed poet speaks of

> "The schools . . .
> Who, *if they do not Priscian the disgrace*
> *To break his head, they foully scratch his face:*
> Torturing poor innocent grammar to confess
> The truth they hide by their dark wowishness."

And then Shakespeare:—

"Bone?—bone fore bene: *Priscian a little scratched*—'twill serve."—*L. L. L.* v. 1.

However, whatever objections our author had to the style and teaching of the grammarians of his day, we read that his own style was "as free from solecism as from pedantry. As we read his letters, which are numerous, *though others, we believe, remain unpublished*, we are impressed no less by the comprehensive interest and industry which made him eager to know everything that was going on in the world than by the moderation with which he writes. . . . He pronounces on the merits of Gilbert and Vietra '*the only two original writers of the age*,' each in his own line, touches with the hand of one who is master in all, such different subjects as the Copernican theory, terrestrial magnetism, selenography, feudal custom, constitutional history, art, ecclesiastical and civil law, Oriental subjects, metaphysics. With all this there is no sign of vanity. Great knowledge of one subject may puff up, but

knowledge so wide and deep as that of Sarpi keeps company with humility. 'He was a man,' says Bishop Sanderson, who knew and loved him, 'of an invincible bashfulness.' Absolutely free from jealousy as from prejudice, he could tolerate all opinions. . . . His philosophy of life, and that temper of endurance and serenity, that sweetness and maturity of affections and spirit ascribed to him by his friend Diodati" is frequently illustrated by passages in his letters, and yet we find that though he used it sparingly, he was not unprovided with "the weapon of grave and temperate irony, and he no need, he says, to provide himself with the 'vile guns' of inductive learning (although 'the whole tone of his mind was Aristotelian and inductive' when his own quiver was so full of sharp arrows—witty and pithy replies and answers ready for immediate use. But for serious political conflict he used artillery, not catapults, appealing to precedent as well as to principle, to what had been done as well as what had been preached. . . . He ascertained facts carefully, and *disregarded authority*, and by so doing he arrived at conclusions which will stand inquiry, and deserved the praise of so conscientious a seeker of truth as Gibbon."

"He was a critic in everything,* but not a denier. . . . A saint may hold strong opinions, and express them with a caustic wit. *All agree to praise his wonderful modesty.* 'He was the humblest thing breathing.' He is said never to have spoken an impatient word, and the only complaint which his friends made was that he would not take care of himself. . . . It is an illustration of the vanity of human studies that one of the greatest natural philosophers of his age should now be chiefly known as the author of a history which is read by none but historians. Compensation for this may be found in the recollection that it is chiefly for the beauty of his moral character, the purity, modesty, and impartiality which found in company with a rare intellect that a later age still takes pleasure in hearing the story of Fra. Paulo, and the more we read of him the more we are inclined to repeat the lament of his friends when they lost him: *Non verra pere mai un Fra. Paulo;*" or, to make a free translation in the words of Hamlet—

> "He was a man, take him for all in all,
> I shall not look upon his like again."

Probably very few of those who will read these pages are

* "I am nothing if not critical."—*Oth.* ii. 1.

acquainted with the bulky folio entitled "The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D.," and of which the fourth edition was published by Roger Norton (Lady Anne Bacon's relative) in 1677. It consists of a series of theological discourses or sermons, ninety-eight epistles on learned subjects connected with Divinity, and some commentaries on the Scriptures. The work seems to have been first published about 1638.

At the beginning of this work (but after the general Preface) is "The Author's Life," and to this we turn, in order to obtain "*a faithful though imperfect pourtrait* of this excellent person, the authour of the ensuing discourses." The biographical particulars are scanty and not very interesting, and would not fill five out of forty-five pages of which this "Life" consists.

We learn in brief that "Joseph Mede was born in October, 1586, of parents of honest rank, at Berden, in Essex." His father died when Joseph was 10 years old. The mother married again Mr. Gower, of Nasing, by whom he was sent to school at Hodsden. There, having procured a Hebrew grammar, he began to learn Hebrew by himself, and being found to be a forward and studious boy, he was sent to Cambridge in 1602. He studied for three years at Christ's College, first under Daniel Rogers, then under William Addison, and took the degree of Master of Arts. Being made Fellow of Christ's College, he became reader and tutor, and instructed several persons of honour and eminency in the State. He died in his college room in October, 1638, and "his college to which, while he lived, he was so illustrious an ornament is now he is dead his monument."

These few dry details are all that we gather concerning the man himself, excepting that "he had so great a hesitancy in his speech as rendered his expression painful to himself and others. The forty or more folio pages which remain are filled with disquisitions upon "the pregnancy of his parts," "his happy progress through *all kinds* of academical studies," and "the early proofs which he gave of being designed for profound contemplations" by the manner in which he found his way out of the troublesome labyrinths of perplexed notions by which Pyrrho had industriously studied to represent the habitation of truth as inaccessible. "He was justly styled 'Master of Arts' and universally esteemed as one who well understood all those arts which

make up the accomplishment of a scholar. He was an acute *logician*, an accurate *philosopher*, a skilful *mathematician*, an excellent *anatomist*, a great *philologer*, a master of many *languages*, proficient in *history* and *chronology*, . . . a great *florist* and accurate *herbalist*, *thoroughly versed in the Book of Nature, not unseen in any kind of ingenious knowledges for delight or use.*" Moreover, we read in another place, "In his youth he spent no small pains in sounding the depths of '*astrology*,' the doctrines of '*sympathy and antipathy*,' employing himself in his retirement in a curious inquiry into the most abstruse parts of learning, and endeavouring for the knowledge of those things which were remote from the common track."

He also wrote "an unparalleled commentary upon that mysterious book, the Apocalypse," a work high esteemed by Bishop Usher, and which was translated into French. But again it is necessary to suppress and curtail the dissertations upon the wonderful books, and their sentiments and doctrines expounded in language curiously analagous to that of Baxter's "Saint's Rest" and other books of the same suspicious authorship.

We read of the author's "noble genius leading him on to encounter difficulties in research and arguments which had never before been met and mastered. "As if he accounted them but half-scholars that did only *ex commentario sapere* . . . he was not wont to take expositions of Scripture upon the credit of any author nor to look upon their resolves *as if they were Hercules Pillars* with a *ne plus ultra* upon them." Thus we see how entirely he was at one with Francis Bacon and Fra. Paolo in their objection to accepting unproved authority.

Now, for the personal character of this author, we find that his *humility* and extreme *modesty* are the first points specially noted. "Although his various perfections and useful accomplishments made his company most desirable to scholars, so the goodness of his disposition made him equally communicative and free to impart his knowledge." He was totally without ostentation and affectation, but a hater of such vanity, and could not without trouble hear himself praised or his abilities extolled. He greatly preferred "retirement" and his "poor cell" to any public or academical honours. "The height of his ambition was only to have had some small donative *sine cura* . . . some such place of quiet retirement from the noise and tumults of the world, with a competency moderated by Agur's wish, *neither poverty nor riches*, was the top and utmost

of his desires, not that he would be restless or discontented, but to show what kind of life he did affect."

We know how in his trouble and threatened fall Francis St. Alban expressed himself to the same effect, and almost in the same words, from his "full poor cell," and saying that all he desired was that he might "live to study, not study to live." "For my part, I see an *otium*, and if it may be so, a fat *otium*. Yet I am prepared for a *date obolum Belisario;* and I that have borne a bag can bear a wallet." *

"But though our author lived a retired studious life, his thoughts were not shut up within his *cell; but his soul covered the whole earth, his heart was as large and wide as the universe. He so lived and was affected as became a citizen of the world.*" That he might be the better informed as to "how the world goes," he kept up correspondence with knowing friends, and even spent money in paying for intelligence (weekly, for the most part) from foreign parts. He had a strong interest solicitude for the affairs of the Reformed Church, and most desirous for unity and peace; his designs for this purpose he called "heroic."

Together with his liberality of views and his generosity in imparting all that he knew or discovered, he combined a great reticence on certain subjects, and, with regard to unworthy persons, "he would not *cast pearls before swine.*" "He was content not to impart any of his *peculiar notions* but where he found some appetite and stomach. Much less would he *cram* them." As he disliked controversy, so he never hotly defended his own opinions, being confident that in the end "truth will be justified of all her children."

The biographer then winds up with a long dissertation of "Joseph Mede's" temperance, moderation, tenderness of affection, natural warmth of feeling, zeal, and all-pervading and diffusive large-minded love and charity—his zeal for God's honour and his devotion to Church and State; his well-grounded judgment and constancy of opinion in matters which he had tested; his abhorrence of idolatry, superstition, and irreverence, returning again and again to the total absence of conceit and pride; or malice or unkindness to be seen in him, and of the purity, peacefulness, and simplicity of his nature, together with his *submissiveness* and "incomparable patience" in times of suffering and trial, that we may be quite sure as to the individual described under the name of Joseph Mede. Our author describes his person.

* See Spedding (*L. L.* vii. 351).

"His body was of a comely proportion, rather of a tall than low stature. In his younger years he was but slender and spare of body; but afterwards, when he was grown, he became more fat and portly, yet not to any such extent as did diminish, but rather increased the goodliness of his presence to a comely decorum. His eye was full, quick and sparkling, His whole countenance composed to a sedate seriousness and gravity: *Majestas et Amor* were well met here, an *awfull Majesty*, but withall an *inviting sweetness*. His behaviour was friendly and affable, intermixed with chearfulness and inoffensive pleasantry. His complexion was a little swarthy, as if somewhat overtinctured with *melancholy*, which yet rather seemed to serve the design of his studious mind then to clog it with those infirmities which commonly attend that humour. . . . It could not be observed but that his vitals were strong, . . . but the subservient faculties did not duly perform their offices* . . . and yet there was nothing in the irregularities of his natural œconomy, which made him fall short of that chief desire of all wise men, the having *mentem sanam in corpore sano.*"

THE PUBLICATION OF THE SHAKESPEARE FOLIO, 1623.

TRANSCRIPT OF THE STATIONERS' REGISTERS (1554—1640).

8 Nov., 1623.

Master Blounte. Isaak Jaggard.

ENTRED for their copie under the hands of Master Doctor Worrall and Master Cole, Warden — Master WILLIAM Shakespeare's *Comedys, Histories,* and *Tragedys*—So manie of the said copies as are not formerly entred to other men.

Comedys.

The Tempest.
The Two Gentlemen of Verona.
Measure for Measure.
As you like it.
Twelfe Night.
The Winter's Tale.

* In the margin of "Mede's Life," page 32, is a note observing that the same was the case with Fra. Paul, of Venice. We know from his own notes and prescriptions that the observations apply directly to Francis St. Alban.

Histories. The third parte of Henry y^e^ Sixt.
Henry the Eight.

Coriolanus.
Timon of Athens.
Julius Cæsar.
Mackbeth.
Anthonie and Cleopatra.
Cymbeline.

It is at once observable that only 14 out of the 36 Plays in the *Shakespeare* folio of 1623 are entered at that date in the registers of the Stationers' Company. Upon inquiry, the present writer was informed by a librarian at the British Museum that this list does not include *Plays which had already been published,* and that this is implied in the statement that this list includes only "such copies as are *not entred to other men.*"

This explanation did not appear altogether satisfactory, neither did the register seem to be such as would naturally be expected in the case of a book of such pre-eminent value and merit as the 1623 folio of the Shakespeare Plays. We therefore looked a little further into the matter, and found that the following are the Plays said by Dr. Delius and many other Shakespearean writers to have been published before the date of the folio 1623:—

Richard II. 1597
Richard III. 1597

These are the two historical Plays included with other pieces (Comedies, Devices, &c.) in a list of works by Mr. Francis Bacon on the outside leaf of the paper-book found by Mr. Halliwell Phillips amongst the Northumberland MSS.

Romeo and Juliet.....1597
Love's Labour's Lost ...1598
The Merchant of Venice 1598
1st Pt. Henry IV.....1598
2nd ,, ,, ...1598
Titus Andronicus.....1600
Midsummer N. Dream..1600
Henry V. 1600

Much Ado	1600	
Merry Wives	1602	
Julius Cæsar	1603	
Hamlet	1603	(Entered one year sooner at Stationers' Hall.)
King Lear	1608	
Troilus and Cressida	1609	
Pericles	1609	(Entered one year before at Stationers' Hall.)

Here are 17 Plays published *before* the publication of the folio 1623. The Stationers' Register accounts for 14 other Plays.

But 14+17=31, and in the 1623 folio there are 36 Plays, albeit that only 35 are included in the "Catalogue of the Severall Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies Contained in this Volume." The *almost unpaged* (but strangely paged) *Troilus and Cressida* is the Play omitted. That Play will prove a fertile field for research. For the present, to stick to our text. What are the five Plays in the folio. published for the first time in that volume, and *omitted* from the registers of the Stationers' Company? and why were they omitted? The answer to the first part of this question is easy. The omitted Plays are :—

The Comedy of Errors.
1st Part Henry VI.
" " "
All's Well.
The Taming of the Shrew.

The second half of the question we are unable to answer. Perhaps decipherers may presently throw some light upon it. Meanwhile, we see clearly that the omission is *intentional*, and for some purpose known to those who direct the actions of the printing and publishing world. For a thing so easy to see, and so distinctly incorrect, would long ago have been pounced upon and made the subject of Shakespearean disquisition, had it not been to the interest of somebody to keep it discreetly in the background.

It is probable that a careful examination of the Stationers Registers might furnish suggestive information as to true authorships. We cannot forget that in none of the registers published by the old Shakespeare Society, neither in the Stationers', nor in "Henslowe's Diary," nor in "Alleyne's Memoirs or Accounts," is there any mention of "Shake-

speare" (spelt in any form) except the marginal note—Shagsberd—which occurs twice against some entry of payment on account of the *Merchant of Venice.*

Now that the study of the Life and Works of Francis St. Alban is happily extending in all directions, and freed from the trammels of mere "Bacon and Shakespeare" controversy, it would be very useful if the same kind of inquiries which were made concerning the greatest of his poetic works were to be turned upon matters connected with Spenser, Peele, Greene, Jonson, and the almost unknown host of minor dramatists and poets of greater or less magnitude, whose claims to authorship are daily becoming more and more discredited, and whose "garlands should be placed upon the proper head."

FRANC-BACONRY FROM THE GERMAN STANDPOINT.

IN Francis Bacon's "Notes on the State of Christendom" (Vol. VIII., p. 24) he mentions "Julius, Duke of Brunswick, at the strong castle of Wolfenbüttle on the Occar." Spedding, curiously ignorant of the river on which the two cities of Brunswick and Wolfenbüttle are built, improves upon Bacon by substituting the word Oder, adding a note (Occar in MS.). In drawing attention to this by letter, Edwin Bormann, a supporter of the Bacon-Shakespeare theory in Germany, satirises the knowledge of English scholars. "Francis Bacon," he says, "while still quite a young man, was better versed in things appertaining to Brunswick than many a grey-headed scholar of the present day."

Borman says no more, except to point out that Duke Heinrich Julius (born 1589, and who died at Prague, 1613) was the brother-in-law of James I., the first German dramatist, and a promoter of the drama and its English actors who repeatedly in 1600 visited the German Courts.

Once upon a time the grey old castle of Wolfenbüttle possessed not only the little ducal theatre upon whose stage Lessing, the dramatist, first produced his Plays, but an "excellent library," the treasures of which are now transferred to the fine "Augusta Bibliothek," which rises behind Lessing's pretty one-storied house and garden, and to one side of the "strong castle." On its fine façade is sculp-

tured the cryptic Owl within a Shell, and within the "Besuch Zimmer" stands (one of two busts) the handsome Shakespeare, with the lace collar, so unlike in its intellectual and "spirituel" beauty the portrait which we are taught at Stratford-on-Avon to call William Shaxper. In this Bibliothek lie MSS. worth the handling, notably those of Johann Valentin Andreä, a philosopher and divine whose earnestness and good faith are above suspicion. During the years 1607—1614 he was employed in travelling about on secret embassies, and was closely connected with both Michael Maier and his English friend, Robert Fludd.

We have evidence of how highly Maier was respected in England. It was doubtless his influence which decided Fludd to publish all his works at Frankfort and Oppenheim "on inferior German printing paper." Fludd, like Maier and Andreä, dreamed a dream, and lived to see it realised, and this was to put into form and shape "Bacon von Verulamis Island of Ben Salem," establishing it not for an age, but for all time. To accomplish this, he went to Germany. Both Fludd and Andreä are credited with works which, as Herr Nicolai points out, they neither of them laid claim to.

"The Fama and Reformation of the World" is said to have compassed mighty results in the beginning of the 17th century. It circulated in MS. during 1610, and in 1614 it was printed. In 1617, at Oppenheim, Fludd published (under the name of "Otreb") "*De Vita, Morte et Resurrectione.*"

If I mistake not, Francis Bacon, in his "Natural History," in a little Introduction entitled "The History of Life and Death," says (p. 52), "Thus much by way of preface. Let us now proceed to the topics of the Inquisition, concerning which you must read 'The History of Life and Death.'"

Friedrich Nicolai, the friend of Lessing, who was the first man to introduce the Shakespeare cult into Germany, published in Berlin (1782) an interesting work on the "Charges Brought Against the Order of Knights Templar," and in this he points out that, which, if we are observant, will throw much light on a matter of considerable importance with regard to Bacon.

It is the interchangeableness of the letters M and B. Let us note this in our book of memory. He mentions it with regard to the words "Mahomet" and "Bahomet," which he holds are, and always were, identical. This taken in connection and with regard to what he says later, quoting from "Old and

New Mysteries" (Berlin, p. 279) is significant. He is tracing the history of modern Masonry, and proving that it sprang from the ideas of a few learned men, the Rosicrucian brotherhood, eager for the Reformation of the world, who accomplished its establishment by means of a secret society "*according to one of the noblest ideas of Bacon.*"

Nicolai does not beat about the bush; he proclaims this fact clearly, and says, further, something which causes much light to blaze out upon a subject hitherto so hidden in allegory and fable that half the world has missed its true meaning. This is the quotation he makes: "Masonry does not acknowledge Germany, but Britain for its nearest fatherland." And again quoting from p. 293, he says, "It can be well authenticated that the Order was brought from France into Britain." "Contradictory," says Nicolai, "as this sounds, the author knows very well what he means. One has only to know precisely of *what* he exactly speaks. When this is so, all I affirm and all he affirms agrees entirely, even though his intention and mine are different." Yes. From *France*, "our Abraham France," as John Donne would say. "Franc-Maçonnerie" springs, without any doubt, from *Francis*, and in England it must become known as Free-Masonry, not Franc-Baconry, as its "exalted father"—"*Abourama*," or "Father Abraham," or *Abi-Albon* (father of strength) ordains.

And thus it is that Germany and the "Augusta Bibliothek" at Wolfenbüttle afford a new strong link in the great chain. It is because I am persuaded that Germany will yet prove a fruitful source from which to draw waters from the well of truth with regard to Francis Bacon and "his life private and concealed as well as public," that I accept the suggestion made by your Society, and use your valuable pages "as a *mouth*-piece."

SHAKSPER NOT SHAKESPEARE.

WHENEVER a new discovery or theory is broached in the present age, books are sure to be written about it. The writers may be by turns slanderous, malicious, ill-informed, or contemptuous, but sooner or later, and, in spite of all, book upon book will be written, until errors in the original statements or theories have been sifted out, and the true grains of golden knowledge collected and stored. For Truth is Truth to the end of the chapter. At the time when the last number of *Baconiana* was all but printed, a book by Mr. W. H. Edwards, entitled, "*Shaksper not Shakespeare,*"* was sent to our Editor; it could not then be properly noticed, and we desire again to draw to it the attention of Baconian Scholars, and those especially to whom the whole subject is comparatively new.

The title alone is sufficient to inform the reader that the book does not get beyond the "Bacon-Shakespeare" controversy, indeed, it does not profess to reach even so far, and the author declares as much; for, having asserted in the introduction that he can prove the Shakespeare Plays to have been *not* written for Shaksper's theatre—that excepting in special scenes, or in pantomime, no one of them was ever played in that theatre, and that no man during Shaksper's lifetime suspected him of any authorship whatsoever—having shown that the Sheksper myth originated in the verses of Ben Jonson (which Mr. Edwards regards as bitter ridicule),† the writer says: "I show that Shaksper died as devoid of accomplishments as when he entered London—unknown to any man of letters or of eminence, unnoticed and unlamented. . . . It is enough for me to prove that William Shaksper did not write these Plays. Who did, I know not, and offer no suggestions." He nevertheless endorses the opinion of Mr. Appleton Morgan, that "there were several associates who wrote under the name of William Shakespeare."

That Mr. Edwards should thus focus his field of view upon one spot, renders this book all the more valuable for its purpose. Here we have in brief, and clearly and methodically set forth, first, the "Proposition" that Shaksper did *not* write the works attributed to him, in which case some one else must have done so; then, the "Demonstration," founded chiefly on citations from Halliwell-Phillips' "*Outlines on the Life of*

* Pub. Cincinnati; The Robert Clarke Company, 1900.
† See Note at the end.

Shakespeare," and Dr. Ingleby's "*Centurie of Prayse.*" The former volume Mr. Fleay (a Shakespearian of eminence in America) terms "a treasure house of documents,"* and upon this excellent basis Mr. Edwards grounds his general argument, but not without consulting most of the now very numerous works from Rowe and Dr. Johnson down to the present day, which bear directly or indirectly upon the theses, now almost worn threadbare, connected with the burning question—"Did Shaksper write *Shakespeare?*"

It is on the score especially of the concentration of this book to one point, its limited area, that we do not hesitate to recommend it to the perusal of readers who may wish to get some idea of the subject, yet shrink from the labour of collecting information for themselves, or even of facing such a portentous volume as the last edition of the "Outlines." Here may they read, and see proved from the documents cited by the most erudite and distinguished Shakespearean scholars, all that is to be known, and a great deal more that has been assumed or "supposed," about "the illiterate butcher," or "the heaven-born genius" (according as we spell his name). Here is registered all that is generally ascertained about his family, home, surroundings and education (or total lack of it), with evidence already often brought forward to show that not only William Shaksper never learned to write, but that he never knew how to spell his own name. There are two very interesting chapters upon the Ignorance of Contemporaries respecting Shaksper, the absolute absence of facts bearing on his Literary Character, and the lack of any proof that he was personally known to any great man of the day, or to any of the lesser scholars and artists excepting a few of his fellow-craftsmen. The absence even of the name "Shakespeare" or "Shaksper," is dwelt upon as most remarkable. Emerson bears witness to the fact, patent to any who will seek, that Sir Henry Wotton, who mentions in his correspondence almost everyone of note in his day, *omits Shakespeare.* Halliwell-Phillips says that in a long series of letters from John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, from 1598—1623—"letters full of the news of the month, of the Court, the city, the pulpit, the booksellers' shops (in which Court masques are described in minute detail—authors, actors, plot, performance, reception, and all), *we look in vain for the name of Shakespeare, or any of his plays.*"

* These documents were reproduced, word for word, by Mr. D. W. Wilder, in 1893.

Mr. Edwards might have added that neither in the "*Accounts of the Revels at Court*" (published by the First Shakespeare Society, in their editions of the "*Memoirs*," and the "*Accounts*" of Edward Alleyne, the actor, and ostensible founder of Dulwich College), in "*Henslowe's Diary*," nor, more wonderful still, in the two volumes of the "*Accounts of the Stationers' Company*" (also published by the Society), is there any mention of *Shakespeare*. Two entries of payments in connection with the performance of the "*Merchant of Venice*" have the marginal note, "Shaxbird." When such things as these are duly weighed and considered it appears astounding that any person possessed of even the feeblest powers of reasoning, should be found still to credit the "fanciful might-have-beens" of which Mr. Fleay speaks. But as a rule it appears to be not so much lack of brains as lack of knowledge, which prevents most of our opponents from even looking into the subject, or even from putting together the facts collected by the many industrious and cultivated Shakespeare scholars, who have written or spoken in praise of the immortal poet. To such as these we heartily commend Mr. Edwards' valuable, suggestive, and extremely readable book.

Some points noted by Mr. Edwards may with advantage be followed up by industrious inquirers. On page 11 he quotes the late Richard Grant White with regard to the spelling of the name *Shakespeare*:—"The name sometimes appears Chaksper, or Shaksper."

That spelling of the name was a matter discussed in writing by the present writer some fifteen years ago, *apropos* to an entry observed in Francis Bacon's private journal or table book, which he termed *Transportata*. The entry is to this effect:—"To see Mr. Chr. on Wednesday concerning my new inventions." Spedding takes this to mean that Francis was to see the Lord Chancellor in connection with some Act of Parliament, or other measure. But there is no tittle of evidence in favour of this assumption. On the other hand, it it is unlikely that Francis would write Mr. for Lord Chancellor, and highly improbable that he would term Acts of Parliament, or schemes of measures to be undertaken, "inventions"—a word which he seems almost invariably to have applied to *works of the imagination*.

In one of his letters he explains his neglect in some matter personal of business which has caused trouble or loss "to fall upon and seize him." He says that at the time when this important business was in hand, he overlooked it: "my mind

being then wholly occupied with my *inventions*." It was endeavoured to show that in the entry the C might be mistaken for S, those letters in old English writing often closely resembling each other. Then we should readily read: "To see Mr. S(hakspe)r on Wednesday concerning my new (dramatic) inventions." But if Shaksper sometimes wrote, or if others wrote, for his name, Chaksper, the explanation is simple.

Grant White is also quoted as suggesting that "Shakespeare is a corruption of some name of a more peaceful meaning, and, therefore, perhaps of a humbler derivation;" and Dr. Morgan supposes the name to have been simply Jacques Pierre (or John Peter). He describes the ordinary country manner of sounding Jacques like *Shak*, as "mispronunciation, ... prevalent in Warwickshire." In point of fact, very few distinctive differences either in vocabulary or pronunciation are to be found in Warwickshire, when compared with other counties and in the list of words from the so-called "Warwickshire dialect" we found not one *used in Shakespeare*; which is not as common to other English rural districts as to Warwickshire. The Warwickshire dialect theory of Shakespeare is one of many delusions. As to "Jacques Pierre," it is quite possible that Shaksper was a corruption. Anyhow, the kindred sounds were sufficient for the witty poet who "never could pass by a jest." Readers who have "*Montaigne's*" essays at hand should turn to his little paraphrase of the text "What's in a name?"—(We think that the passage was printed a year or two ago in *Baconiana*). Here the author asks what it signifies, whether he be known by his own name or that of another? It is all one to him whether he be called William, Jacques, or Peter (*or words to that effect*), we cannot quote by the book; but we know that Francis lost no opportunity of connecting himself occultly with his unacknowledged works, and that right and left he punned upon the names Bacon and Shakespere, which were his leading *noms-de-plume*. In an old book published anonymously many years ago, and entitled "The Book of God" or the "Apocalypse," it is mentioned that Minerva was called Pallas, because she "vibrates a javelin" ("shakes a spear.") This Mr. Reed quotes with the observation that "Athens, the home of the drama, was under the protection of the Spear-shaker."

Again, the Spear-shaker is brought to our notice in the portrait somewhat resembling Francis, but with the name "Quiriuus" which appears on one of the books which we

ascribe to him. We know that this name of "Quiriuus" or the Spear-shaker was applied to him by his own friends, and used in one of the Elegies or Eulogies written by them, and collected by Dr. Rawley. They have already been published in this magazine.

We should also have commented upon the views of Mr. Edwards with regard to Ben Jonson, but the subject requires more space than can be given at the present time. We only add therefore, that we should be glad to see the same expert pen applied to the facts of Ben Jonson's (or truly *Johnson's*) life, which has been so successful in setting down the personal records of Shaxper.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

APROPOS of the article on "Canonbury Tower," that appeared in your last issue, I would like to lay the following facts before your readers. It will be remembered that a secret passage connected Canonbury Tower with St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell. Between St. John's Street and Clerkenwell Green stood, already in the end of Elizabeth's reign (presumably), the Red Bull Theatre, as large as the Fortune, and as popular. Shakespeare's Plays were acted here for some time by "*an independent company*," of whose success the king's company grew jealous. Also there Prince Henry's Players acted an old Play in 1623, called "The Peaceable King." The stage was erected in the midst of an Inn yard. The groundlings stood; the paying audience for a small sum sat in the Inn galleries. The *actors wore vizards*, the reason put forward being that they doubled their parts.

Ned Ward, the rustic poet, lived a century after on this spot, and wrote lines :—

> "There on that ancient venerable ground, where
> Shakespeare in heroic buskins trod."

Has the theory ever been mooted that the *real author* of the Plays himself took parts in them masked on the stage of the Red Bull?

Can any reader of BACONIANA trace this missing speech and substantiate this story?

It has been alleged that Thomas Bushell, a learned man, Francis S. Alban's Seal-bearer, and a member of his household during the time he was Lord Chancellor, printed in one of his works an oration which his Lordship intended making in Parliament, had he not been removed from office. The subject of the speech was the founding of the Royal Academy of the Sciences on lines laid down in one of his books.

This, of course, was Salomon's Temple, in the New Atlantis.

3 8198 304 896 689
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO